

Land Adjacent to Bromley College (17/05084/FULL1) - Addendum for Committee 25/4/2018

Since the publication of the committee report, it has been brought to Officer's attention that there has been a previous application in addition to that noted within the planning history section of the report - 03/00246/DEEM3.

Officers have considered the plans and note that the 2003 application was refused by committee for the following three reasons:

1. The proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site with a likely excessive bulk and height, out of character with the locality and contrary to Policy H.2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policy H.6 of the second deposit draft Unitary Development Plan (September 2002).
2. The proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the adjacent Listed Buildings and their settings and visually intrusive when seen from neighbouring properties, and as such the proposal is contrary to Policy E.5 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policy BE7 of the second deposit draft Unitary Development Plan (Sept 2002).
3. The proposal would be likely to result in the loss of existing trees within the grounds of Bromley College, which would be detrimental to the amenities of the area, contrary to Policies E.7 and G.28 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policies BE9 and NE7 of the second deposit draft Unitary Development Plan.

The application is different from that under consideration by Members with the most notable differences being:

- The previous application was for two, four storey blocks
- The application proposed one break within the built form, rather than the two proposed in this case
- Parking was proposed along the rear common boundary with the College buildings
- The application was proposed in outline (for matters of siting, external appearance, design and means of access) and for 28 units with a more modern design

It is the case that since this time there has been a more recent planning application and dismissed appeal (ref: 08/00397/FULL1 and APP/G5180/A/08/2087580). Officers have considered the planning history and do not consider that the recommendation as laid out within the report would change as a result of this application.